


mens specifically designed for carrying out the
said process..."

This is the exact situation here: a method and an apparatus for carrying out the method. Not only does the apparatus claim directly refer to the method claim, but it covers basically the same inventive concept.

The statement that the case lacks a single general inventive concept cannot have been based on any familiarity with this application. It is boilerplate.

If the restriction requirement is upheld, the examiner is requested to explain why 37 CFR 1.475 does not apply to this PCT case.

Respectfully submitted,
K.F. Ross P.C.


by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

13 February 2008
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure: None.